DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 120 EC 309 941

AUTHOR	Johns, Beverley H., Ed.; Guetzloe, Eleanor C., Ed.
TITLE	Inclusive Education for Children and Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Enduring Challenges and Emerging Practices. Fifth CCBD Mini-Library Series: Meeting the Diverse Needs of Children and Youth with E/BD--Evidence-Based Programs and Practices.
INSTITUTION	Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.
ISBN	ISBN-0-86586-987-1
PUB DATE	2004-00-00
NOTE	71p.; Series Editors: Lyndal M. Bullock, Robert A. Gable, and Kristine J. Melloy.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Exceptional Children, 1110 N. Glebe Rd., Suite 300, Arlington, VA 22201 (Stock No. D5514). Tel: 888-232-7733 (Toll Free); Fax: 703-264-9494; e-mail: service@cec.sped.org; Web site: http://www.cec.sped.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Change; *Behavior Disorders; Case Studies; Compliance (Legal); Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; Federal Legislation; *Inclusive Schools; School Administration; Service Learning; *Student Placement; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This document presents a range of evidence-based strategies, procedures, and models appropriate for inclusive education intervention programs with children and youth with emotional and/or behavioral disorders. Chapters have the following titles and authors: (1) "Placing Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings: An Analysis of the Law" (Mitchell Yell); (2) "Instructional Strategies for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Inclusive Settings" (Eleanor C. Guetzloe and Beverley H. Johns); (3) "I Can Be of Help Too! Service Learning as a Tool for Enhancing the Education of Students with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders" (Howard S. Muscott); (4) "From the Road to School to Home, Ensuring No Child Left Behind: Practical Behavioral Strategies That Include Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders" (Beverley H. Johns and Eleanor C. Guetzloe); (5) "Administrative Issues in Inclusive Education: Needed Supports" (Robin Bauer); and (6) "Inclusion--What Works. Case Studies" (Barbara Sramek and others). (Contains approximately 75 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 477 120

From the Fifth CCBD Mini-Library Series: Meeting the Diverse Needs of Children and Youth with E/BD: Evidence-Based Programs and Practices

Inclusive Education for Children and Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Enduring Challenges and Emerging Practices

Beverley H. Johns
Eleanor C. Guetzloe
Editors

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L.M. Bullock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

° Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CCBD
Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

EC 309941

Lyndal M. Bullock, Robert A. Gable,
& Kristine J. Melloy, *Series Editors*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From the Fifth CCBD Mini-Library Series: Meeting the Diverse Needs of Children and Youth with E/BD: Evidence-Based Programs and Practices

Inclusive Education for Children and Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Enduring Challenges and Emerging Practices

Beverley H. Johns
Eleanor C. Guetzloe
Editors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lyndal M. Bullock, Robert A. Gable, & Kristine J. Melloy, *Series Editors*

The Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, *Publisher*

About the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

CCBD is an international and professional organization committed to promoting and facilitating the education and general welfare of children and youth with behavioral and emotional disorders. CCBD, whose members include educators, parents, mental health personnel, and a variety of other professionals, actively pursues quality educational services and program alternatives for persons with behavioral disorders, advocates for the needs of such children and youth, emphasizes research and professional growth as vehicles for better understanding behavioral disorders, and provides professional support for persons who are involved with and serve children and youth with behavioral disorders.

In advocating for the professionals in the field of behavioral disorders, CCBD (a division of The Council for Exceptional Children) endorses the Standards for Professional Practice and Code of Ethics adopted by the Delegate Assembly of The Council for Exceptional Children in 1983.

Stock No. D5583

ISBN 0-86586-987-1

Copyright © 2004 by the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, a Division of The Council for Exceptional Children, 1110 North Glebe Road, Arlington, VA 22201-5704.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Foreword v

1. Placing Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings: An Analysis of the Law 1

Mitchell Yell, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Placement and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2
Placement and the Least Restrictive Environment 4
Inappropriate Factors for Determining Placement 7
Recommendations 8
Conclusion 10

2. Instructional Strategies for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Inclusive Settings . . . 11

Eleanor C. Guetzloe, Clearwater, Florida

Beverley H. Johns, Jacksonville, Illinois

Appropriate Curriculum Organization and Methods 12
Selecting Specific Strategies and Techniques 13
Selecting Appropriate Strategies for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders 17
Conclusion 17

3. I Can Be of Help Too! Service Learning as a Tool for Enhancing the Education of Students with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders 19

Howard S. Muscott, Rivier College, Nashua, New Hampshire

Services Learning and Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders 22

gning Effective Service Learning Programs 24
tive Behavioral Interventions and Support and
ervice Learning 26
clusion 31

4. m the Road to School to Home, Ensuring Child Left Behind: Practical Behavioral ategies That Include Students with Emotional l Behavioral Disorders 33
rley H. Johns, Jacksonville, Illinois
nor C. Guetzloe, Clearwater, Florida 34
ning and Support for School Personnel 35
tive School Climate 36
rnatives to Suspension 39
ental Involvement and Support 40
clusion 41

5. ministrative Issues in Inclusive Education: eded Supports 43
n Bauer, Braidwood Elementary, Illinois
mmunicate, Communicate, Communicate 44
porting Students 44
porting Teachers 46
clusion 48

6. usion—What Works. Case Studies 49
van Sramek, Marshall, Wisconsin, Public Schools
n Brewer, University of Northern Colorado
i Seger, Traverse City, Michigan, Public Schools
ie Huber, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, School District #41
a Westpfahl, Puyallup, Washington, School District
duction 49
na 50
es–A Student in a Secondary Rural Setting 52
ent K—A Preschooler 53
n 56

7. nclusion 59

erences 61

Foreword

Today, we find ourselves in the midst of difficult and uncertain times. Circumstances place some at greater risk than others. For example, a rapidly changing political and economic climate poses threats to children and youths who manifest noncompliance, antisocial behavior, or acting-out behavior. In addition, it is clear that recent federal legislation (i.e., No Child Left Behind and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) will have a major impact on the landscape of both general education and special education. Both of these Acts contain a number of positive provisions; however, they also have raised questions among those who serve students identified as *emotionally disturbed, behaviorally disordered,* or *emotionally and behaviorally disordered.* The long-term ramifications are difficult to predict, but there is little doubt that there will be far-reaching effects on the preparation of special education personnel, the nature and scope of programs and services they provide, and the specific population of students they serve.

In light of mounting challenges to serving children and youths with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD), it is good to know that there are a growing number of practices that have compelling empirical evidence for their effectiveness. The Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD) is committed to putting established practices in the hands of its members and supporting efforts to increase the quality of the education and treatment of students with E/BD and their families. The authors of this series discuss in detail a range of evidence-based strategies, procedures, and models that are appropriate for early intervention programs, public and private schools, day and residential treatment programs, correctional

facilities, and other settings in which are students with E/BD are educated.

The following seven volumes comprise the Fifth Mini-Library Series on children and adolescents with E/BD. Their content stems from the 2003 international conference sponsored by the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders:

- *Critical Issues Facing Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders During Transition to Adulthood* by Mary E. Morningstar and Debra Benitez
- *Inclusive Education for Children and Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Enduring Challenges and Emerging Practices* by Beverley H. Johns, Eleanor C. Guetzloe, Editors, and others
- *Differentiating Curriculum and Instruction on Behalf of Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders Within General Education Settings* by Carol Ann Davis, Kathleen L. Lane, Kevin Sutherland, Phillip L. Gunter, R. Kenton Denny, Phillip Pickens, and Joseph Wehby
- *Educating Juveniles with Disabilities in Correctional Settings* by Joseph Calvin Gagnon and Matthew J. Mayer
- *Establishing Exemplary Personnel Preparation Programs for Teachers of Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Partnerships with Schools, Parents, and Community Agencies* by Alec F. Peck, Sandy Keenan, Douglas Cheney, and Richard S. Neel
- *Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* by Festus E. Obiakor, Stephen Enwefa, Cheryl Utley, Sunday O. Obi, Nomsa Gwalla-Ogisi, and Regina Enwefa
- *Prevention and Early Intervention for Young Children at Risk for Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* by Maureen A. Conroy, Editor, and others

In putting together this series, we have relied on the knowledge and skill of a diverse group of dedicated professionals, each of whom is directly involved in the education and treatment of children and youths with emotional and behavioral disorders. We are grateful that they were willing to share their time and expertise and are confident that their work will contribute to improving the quality of intervention efforts for these students.

Lyndal M. Bullock
University of North Texas

Robert A. Gable
Old Dominion University

Kristine J. Melloy
University of St. Thomas

Series Editors

1

Placing Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings

An Analysis of the Law

Mitchell Yell
University of South Carolina, Columbia

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) sets forth a congressional preference for placing students with disabilities in general education classrooms. Today, the majority of students with disabilities are taught alongside students without disabilities. However, placing students with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD) in appropriate educational settings has been a controversial and confusing issue since the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) in 1975. The EAHCA, renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 1990, created a detailed set of rules and guidelines to ensure that students with dis-

abilities would receive an appropriate education in the least restrictive setting. Even so, federal legislation has not been applied equally across disability categories.

In this chapter, I clarify some of the confusion and controversy surrounding the placement of students with disabilities by examining its basis in the IDEA and subsequent legal interpretations by the U.S. Department of Education and in courts across the United States. First, I present the statutory and case law regarding placement. Second, I discuss specific placement issues. Finally, I offer recommendations for educators to follow when making placement decisions to ensure that such decisions are made in a legally correct and educationally appropriate manner.

Placement and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

According to federal legislation, individualized education program (IEP) teams must follow three steps when placing a student in special education. Step 1 is evaluation and identification to determine whether the student has a disability covered by IDEA that adversely affects his or her educational performance. Evaluation also helps the IEP team determine the student's educational needs. Step 2 is the development of the student's IEP. The IEP, which is based on the student's needs as determined in Step 1, consists of annual goals, benchmarks or short-term objectives that guide the student's education, and the specific services that the student will receive. Furthermore, the team must adopt a means of monitoring the student's progress toward his or her goals and determining whether the special education program is effective. The third step is to determine the student's placement based on his or her needs. Thus, the IEP forms the basis of the placement decision (Bartlett, Weisenstein,& Etscheidt, 2002; Bateman & Linden, 1998).

According to IDEA, placement is the process that determines the specific educational setting or facility in which a student's educational goals can be met most appropriately. Placement decisions,

therefore, can only be made after the development of the IEP and in accordance with its terms (IDEA Regulations, 300.552(b)(2); Appendix A to 34 C.F.R. Part 300, Question 14). Clearly the placement of students with disabilities is one of the most important issues that the IEP team will address. In fact, placement has proven to be such an important and controversial area that, in many hearings and court cases, the rulings have hinged on the hearing officer or judge's interpretation of the term (Bartlett et al., 2002).

The Placement Decision

The IDEA and implementing regulations provide little information about who makes the placement decision, except that a student's parents must be involved in the process. According to IDEA, "each local educational agency or state educational agency shall ensure that the parents of each child with a disability are members of any group that makes decisions on educational placement of their child" (IDEA, 20 U.S.C. § 1414(f)). When IDEA was amended in 1997, it stated that the IEP team should make the placement decision. According to the Senate Report on the IDEA Amendments of 1997, "the committee expects that the majority of placement decisions will be made by the IEP team, but in those unique circumstances where it is not, the committee expects parents to be involved in the group making the decision" (*Senate Report* on P.L. 105-17). This emphasis on the IEP team role in placement is new to federal law; however, most states' special education laws have long required that the IEP team be the forum for determining a student's educational placement (Gorn, 1999).

The IEP team must draw upon information from a variety of sources (e.g., aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, social or cultural background, adaptive behavior) when it makes a decision on student placement. Moreover, the IEP team should ensure that all information is documented and considered. No single factor should dominate the placement decision; rather, all factors should receive equal consideration (*Letter to Anonymous,* 1999). Furthermore, a student's educational placement must be determined annually and must be based on his or her IEP

(IDEA Regulations, C.F.R. § 300.552). The IDEA requires that student placement decisions be made in a thoughtful and deliberative manner. Moreover, the student's individual educational needs drive the decision-making process.

An IEP team may also consider the potential harmful effects of the student's placement on his or her peers when making a placement decision. This means that the team may consider the effect the presence of a student with disabilities in a general education classroom would have on the education of other students in that classroom. For example, a student who disrupts the education of others due to behavior problems or because of needing constant teacher attention may not be placed appropriately in a general education classroom. The law does not provide guidance to IEP teams for determining when problem behavior reaches the level of interfering with the learning of the student or others. The court's decisions in *Hartmann v. Loudoun County* (1997) and *Clyde K. and Sheila K. v. Puyallup School District* (1994), however, indicated that such behaviors may include aggression toward teachers and students, serious noncompliance, and disruptive behaviors that significantly impair the education of other students. When weighing the issue of behavior, IEP teams must first consider the use of supplementary aids and services to accommodate a student.

Placement and the Least Restrictive Environment

The placement issue that has proven to be the most controversial, and one of the most frequently litigated, is the IDEA's requirement that students with disabilities be provided a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The LRE mandate requires that students with disabilities receive their education in the general education classroom to the maximum extent appropriate, or, when the general education setting is not appropriate, in a setting with the least amount of separation from the student's peers without disabilities.

The LRE provision of IDEA contains two requirements. First, students with disabilities must be educated with students without disabilities in the general education setting to the *maximum extent appropriate.* This ensures that students with disabilities are educated in the LRE that is suitable for their needs. Second, students with disabilities cannot be removed from general education settings unless education in those settings cannot be achieved satisfactorily. This means that IEP teams should assume that students with and without disabilities should be educated together to the greatest degree possible. When such an education is not appropriate, either for the student with disabilities or for his or her peers without disabilities, the IEP team may move the student to a more restrictive setting that is appropriate.

The general education environment is considered the least restrictive setting because it is the placement in which there is the greatest measure of opportunity for proximity and communication with the ordinary flow of students in schools (Champaign, 1993). From this perspective, the less a placement resembles the general education environment, the more restrictive it is considered to be. However, although IDEA favors student integration, it anticipates that placements in more restrictive settings may sometimes be necessary to provide an appropriate education. In fact, policy letters from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in the Department of Education have indicated that the LRE requirement of IDEA is subordinate to the law's requirement that educational placement must be based on a student's individual needs (*Letter to Lott,* 1989; *Letter to Trahan,* 1998; *Letter to Verguson,* 1991).

In the IDEA Amendments of 1997, Congress emphasized placing students with disabilities in general education classes with their peers without disabilities. If a student's IEP team decides that he or she will not participate in general education classes, the IEP must include a statement explaining the extent of the student's nonparticipation in general education and provide an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with children without disabilities in the general education class (IDEA, 1414(d)(1)(A)(iv)). The purpose of this language is to remind IEP teams of the impor-

tance of integrating students with disabilities in classrooms with students without disabilities (Huefner, 2000).

The Continuum of Alternative Placements

Congress included the continuum of alternative placements in the IDEA to assist school districts in making placement decisions in accordance with the LRE principle. The purpose of the continuum is to make a number of placements available so that a student may be placed in the setting that is most appropriate and least restrictive. The continuum must include instruction in general classes, special classes, and special schools; homebound instruction; and instruction in hospitals and institutions (IDEA Regulations C.F.R. § 300.17). When a school district does not have the placement option needed by a student, the IEP team must find the student an appropriate and least restrictive placement even if it is outside the district. Clearly, no single placement option is appropriate for all students; placement decisions must be based on a student's unique educational needs.

Supplementary Aids and Services

To ensure that schools make good faith efforts to educate students in less restrictive settings, the LRE mandate also requires that if students with disabilities are placed in more restrictive settings, efforts must first be made to maintain them in less restrictive settings with the use of supplementary aids and services. It is only when an appropriate education cannot be provided, even with the use of supplementary aids and services, that they may be placed in more restrictive settings.

When the IDEA was amended in 1997, Congress added the requirement that IEPs must contain a statement of the special education and related services, supplementary aids and services, program modifications, and supports for program personnel to be provided to students with disabilities so that they may be provided with an appropriate education (IDEA 1414(d)(1)(A)(iii). Huefner (2002) argued that the result of these changes is to focus IEP teams on the importance of finding ways that allow students with disabilities to

be successful with students without disabilities in general education settings. Nevertheless, she noted that a student's individual needs come first because the general education setting will not be appropriate for all students.

Supplementary aids and services may include consultation, behavior management plans, paraprofessionals, itinerant teachers, resource rooms, assistive technology, staff inservice training, and any other supports for the student and his or her teachers. Etscheidt and Bartlett (1999) proposed a four-step process that the IEP team may use for selecting appropriate accommodations:

1. Develop goals and objectives that ensure access to the general education curriculum.
2. Consider many dimensions of the classroom when determining appropriate supplementary aids and services.
3. Document the entire decision-making process.
4. Monitor the effectiveness of the interventions, which involves developing a method of collecting data about a student's progress toward IEP goals and objectives.

According to Etscheidt and Bartlett (1999), by using this model educators can safeguard themselves against legal actions suggesting that they did not provide a free appropriate public education in the LRE.

Inappropriate Factors for Determining Placement

The U.S. Department of Education has also issued policy letters describing factors that should not be used as sole determining criteria in placement decisions (*Letter to VanWart,* 1993; *Letter to Hall,* 1998; *OSEP Memorandum,* 1994). It is not appropriate for IEP teams to make placement decisions based on the following factors: (a) category of disability, (b) severity of disability, (c) availability of

educational or related services, (d) availability of space, or (e) administrative convenience. For example, placing a student with E/BD in a classroom for students with E/BD just because of his disability label, without first considering the student's individual needs, would be illegal. Similarly, placing a student in a resource room because a school does not have a self-contained placement, even though the student's individual needs indicate that he or she needs such a placement, would not be permissible. It would also be illegal for a school to place all students with disabilities in general education classrooms, a so-called *full inclusion policy,* if that setting would not be appropriate for particular students' individual needs. As Bateman and Linden (1998) stated, although IDEA expresses a preference for placing students with disabilities in general education classes, there is not, nor has there ever been, a requirement for such placement for all children with disabilities. What constitutes the least restrictive placement for a student must be determined individually for that student.

Recommendations

The placement requirements of IDEA have been the subject of much debate and frequent misunderstandings. Nonetheless, we believe that the requirements are clear. The following are some recommendations to help IEP teams to ensure that they make placement decisions in a legally and educationally appropriate manner.

1. *Placement decisions must be made in accordance with the individual needs of each student.* The cornerstone of special education is individualization. This means that we cannot make placement decisions on the basis of a student's disability or apriori notions of where special education should occur. The student must receive a full and individualized evaluation prior to developing programming and determining placement. Educational programming must be made in accordance with the evaluation.

2. *Before IEP teams make placement decisions they must determine what educational programming will be appropriate for individual students.* Nothing in the statutory or case law indicates that placement considerations are intended to replace considerations of program appropriateness. To the contrary, in determining special education and related services, the IEP team's first consideration must be what constitutes an appropriate education for a student. In determining a student's special education, therefore, questions of what educational services are required must precede questions of where they should be provided (Yell, 1998). In making decisions regarding educational services, a student's IEP must address both academic and nonacademic needs (e.g., modeling, social development, communication).

3. *Placement decisions must be made in accordance with the principle of the LRE.* All students with disabilities have a presumptive right to be educated in integrated settings. The LRE mandate in the IDEA set forth a clear preference for such settings. That is, students with disabilities have a right to be educated in the appropriate environment. The courts have repeatedly indicated the importance of this preference. Therefore, school personnel must make good faith efforts to educate students with disabilities in integrated settings. The IDEA's preference for educating students with disabilities in general education classrooms indicates that when an appropriate education can be provided in an integrated setting and the placement will not disrupt the classroom setting, placement in this setting is generally required (Gorn, 1999).

4. *School districts must have a continuum of placements when making placement decisions.* When an IEP team determines that placement in general education with supplementary aids and services will not meet the needs of a student, the team must have the entire continuum of alternative placements from which to choose the appropriate setting. This means that school districts must be able to provide an educational placement in the setting that will meet a student's needs. A school district that does not have an entire continu-

um of placements must have alternative means, such as contracting with larger school districts for services, to obtain the alternative placement required.

Additionally, before an IEP team concludes that a student should be educated in a more restrictive setting, they must consider whether supplementary aids and services would permit an appropriate education in the general education setting. Supplementary aids and services might involve educational options such as a resource room, itinerant instruction, a paraprofessional aide, a behavior intervention plan, or assistive technology. These considerations must be made during IEP development.

Conclusion

Individualized education program teams must understand and follow the requirements of IDEA in making their placement decisions for students with disabilities, including those with E/BD. It is important to underscore the fact that the most important guidelines for making decisions regarding student placement are the principles of *individualization* and *appropriateness*. Special education placements must be tailored individually to meet the unique educational needs of students with disabilities and to provide them with meaningful educational benefits.

2

Instructional Strategies for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Inclusive Settings

Eleanor C. Guetzloe
Clearwater, Florida

Beverley H. Johns
Jacksonville, Illinois

Most authorities argue that the curriculum for students with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD) in inclusive settings should follow, as closely as possible, the general curriculum for youngsters without disabilities who are at the same grade level or chronological age. It should also provide—as it does for students without disabilities—for remediation, maintenance, and enhancement of basic academic skills. Often, however, there must be accommodations

and/or modifications in the instructional materials, schedule, teaching techniques, assignments, grading criteria, and physical environment to ensure the success of students with E/BD. As discussed in Chapter 1, these group/individual decisions must be made according to the characteristics and needs of the student.

In determining an appropriate individualized education program (IEP) for a student with a disability, as required by federal law, the team must take the following into consideration:

- The curriculum should provide for the unique needs of each student as well as the traditional educational demands of the school.
- The curriculum should focus on the specific factors that contributed to the student's eligibility for special education services. These factors should be addressed as goals and objectives in the student's IEP.

Both content and instructional methods must be structured to meet the student's individual needs. Instructional methods may include both (a) the ways in which information will be presented and modified (e.g., individualization, direct instruction, lectures, workbooks, recordings, videos, direct experiences) and (b) behavioral change techniques (e.g., behavior modification, counseling, cognitive strategies). Any of these techniques and methods must be matched to the student's cognitive, social, and emotional developmental levels.

Appropriate Curriculum Organization and Methods

Among the many curricular and organizational provisions that can contribute to the success of an inclusive program are (a) coteaching (by a general classroom teacher and a special education teacher) of the classes in which students with disabilities are included, with a strong commitment on the part of the coteachers to adapt and modify both what is taught and how it is presented for the entire class,

not just the student with a disability; (b) the use of adult mentors and student peer facilitators; (c) flexibility in scheduling for individual students and classes; (d) curricular integration of social skills instruction; and (e) inclusion of community service and other out-of-school activities. Content, materials, and methods that have proved to be effective with students with disabilities should be used in every class in which such students are included (Guetzloe, 2001; Johns, Crowley, & Guetzloe, 2002).

A number of special educators have addressed the accommodations and modifications necessary to ensure the success of students with disabilities who are receiving instruction in inclusive settings (e.g., Alley & Deshler, 1979; Deshler, Ellis, & Lenz, 1996; Dixon, Carnine, & Kameenui, 1996; Friend & Bursuck, 1999; Idol & West, 1993; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000; Meese. 1996; Reif & Heimburge, 1996; Vaughn, Bos, & Schumm, 1997). We encourage you to peruse these and related sources to obtain information on strategies for use in the general classroom.

In the remainder of the chapter, we will address additions, accommodations, and modifications to the curriculum that are particularly suitable for students with E/BD who are receiving instruction in general education classrooms. Suggestions will focus on strategies and techniques for motivating and engaging students with E/BD while teaching the standard curriculum.

Selecting Specific Strategies and Techniques

Some years ago, Siegel (1973) suggested various curriculum-related techniques for solving basic problems of students with E/BD who are placed in general education classrooms, including failure-free activities with no right or wrong answers; limited use of timed activities; short assignments; concrete (i.e., manipulative) materials; activities aimed at helping others; games; and therapeutic activities

(e.g., humor, creative writing, skits, group discussions, role playing with puppets). Some, but not all, of these options have proven effective.

Lewis and Doorlag (1991) applied the concept of intensity of intervention to academic instruction, suggesting that adaptations may be made in

- Instructional materials and activities (e. g., clarifying or shortening directions, adding prompts or cues, addressing specific student errors).
- Teaching procedures (e. g., additional presentations of concepts or skills, additional guided practice, slowing the pace, using more desirable reinforcers.
- Task requirements with the same task (e. g., changing requirements for completion or successful performance, breaking the task into smaller subtasks).
- Selecting an alternate task from the general curriculum (e. g., substituting a prerequisite or easier task related to the same material).
- Selecting a similar task from a different curriculum.

These authors stressed that the task being considered must be at the appropriate level of difficulty for the individual student. Shortening an assignment can be accomplished easily by circling the numbers of a few questions or problems to be completed instead of the entire page.

Larrivee (1985), identified teacher behaviors that were positively related to students' academic, social, and emotional gains. Among them were the following:

- Maintain an organized and efficient learning environment.
- Maximize student time spent on academics and minimize time spent on noninstructional activities.

- Provide students tasks at which they can be successful.
- Use direct and active teaching procedures with groups of students.
- Hold high expectations for student achievement and behavior.

Choate (1997) and colleagues discussed ways to plan and to modify instruction for students with E/BD in inclusive settings:

- Provide highly structured instruction, using consistent routines, stimulus/response formats, and positive reinforcement.
- Contract with students for learning certain skills and charting progress.
- Accommodate individual students' attention and/or frustration-tolerance levels.
- Directly teach social skills and conflict resolution as part of the daily curriculum.
- Directly teach and coach students in the use of learning strategies suitable for addressing each assigned task.

Morgan and Jenson (1988) offered several practical guidelines for teachers of classes in which students with E/BD are included:

- Involve all students during group instruction (not avoiding the student with E/BD).
- Seat students with academic or behavioral problems near the center of active teaching (e. g., middle row, center of semicircle, near the teacher).
- Give clear directions before beginning any activity, using both visual and auditory cues. Be sure all students clearly understand the directions.
- Use a variety of instructional arrangements for organizing the classroom.
- Do not assign too much independent seatwork.

According to Hewett and Taylor (1980), 15 minutes is an appropriate length of time for an instructional activity, whereas Morgan and Jenson (1988) suggested 20 minutes. Regardless of duration, instead of focusing on disruptive behaviors, it is better to work on strengthening academic performance (Ayllon & Roberts, 1974). When academic responses are reinforced, disruptive behaviors decrease.

Mastropieri and Scruggs (2000) recommended that teachers use the PASS variables to make instruction more relevant to the needs of diverse learners in general education classrooms:

- Prioritize objectives.
- Adapt instruction, materials, or the environment.
- Use Systematic instruction (i.e., the SCREAM variables; explained below) during instruction.
- Implement Systematic evaluation procedures.

The SCREAM variables of systematic instruction refer to Structure, Clarity, Redundancy, Enthusiasm, Appropriate pace, and Maximized engagement (including using appropriate materials, questioning, and feedback). Teachers have often commented that these acronyms are easy to remember and useful in their planning.

Mastropieri and Scruggs (2000) have also suggested strategies, many of which are associated with acronyms, for student use in learning specific skills or studying specific content areas in inclusive classrooms. Examples of these include SNOW (Study the question, Note important points, Organize the information, Write directly to the point of the question) to facilitate performance on essay tests); SCORER (Schedule time, Clue words, Omit hard items, Read carefully, Estimate answers, Review work) to help with test performance (Carman & Adams, 1972); and SPACE (Setting, Purpose, Action, Conclusion, Emotions) to help students include detail in their written stories (Harris & Graham, 1992).

Selecting Appropriate Strategies for Students with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders

Not all strategies are useful and practical for every student. As we mentioned previously, the characteristics of students with E/BD often interfere with the teaching and learning process. The entire curriculum for students with E/BD, including learning strategies, must be more effective and more motivating than that for students without disabilities.

It is helpful if the selected strategies are easy to remember, rhythmic, rhyming, or set to music. Many of us can remember learning the alphabet by using the "Alphabet Song." (Some of us can remember thinking that "L-M-N-O" was one letter!) Some of us occasionally stop to remind ourselves—quietly or out loud—"I before E, except after C."

Strategies that are enjoyable or even "quirky" are easiest to remember. For example, "My very educated mother just served us nine pizzas" is helpful in recalling planets in the solar system in order, starting with Mercury, which is closest to the sun. "HOMES" is a clue to remembering the names of the Great Lakes: Huron, Ontario, Michigan, Erie, and Superior.

Regardless of the strategy, it is necessary to teach students not only the strategy itself, but also the prerequisite skills. Strategies that are too long, too complicated, or too difficult to remember should be avoided.

Conclusion

Students with E/BD exhibit a range of behaviors that interfere with and challenge the delivery of effective instruction. Given the magnitude of learning and behavior problems, teachers often feel ill equipped to deal with these students, particularly in general education classrooms. Our discussion has highlighted strategies that may be useful for teaching students with EB/D in inclusive settings.

3

I Can Be of Help Too! Service Learning as a Tool for Enhancing the Education of Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Howard S. Muscott
Rivier College, Nashua, New Hampshire

In retrospect, the 1990s may have been the decade of inclusion, when educational reformers pushed hard to make fundamental changes in the nature of service delivery systems for students with disabilities. During that period, internal and external pressures and politics forced schools to redefine outcomes, restructure programs,

and revamp instructional practices to more effectively educate all students—including those with disabilities—in general education classrooms. The goal of the extreme form of the movement known as full inclusion was the merger of general and special education into a more unified and inclusive system of schooling. Under this mantel programs for students with disabilities were to be eliminated completely. Critics argued that students with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD) presented the inclusive schools movement with its greatest challenge (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988; Bullock & Gable, 1994). They cited the historical record that indicated these students have always been the first asked to leave the classroom and the last invited to return and identified fundamental barriers, such as the intensity of student misbehavior, lack of trained personnel, and the inability to provide a differentiated curriculum (Muscott, Morgan, & Meadows, 1996). Indeed, Kauffman (1993) voiced concern that full inclusion was irresponsible and would lead to fewer program options, less intensive services, and ultimately terrible outcomes for students with E/BD, their families, and the educators who teach them.

In an attempt to provide an evidence-based alternative to full inclusion, Muscott and colleagues (Cheney & Muscott, 1996) argued for responsible inclusion in which (a) decisions regarding student placement are individualized, needs-based, and determined after a functional assessment of the student is conducted; (b) placement is a means to an end—the end being an appropriate educational program that meets each student's unique needs; (c) students with E/BD would be included in general education classrooms *only* when there are sufficient supports in place to meet the needs of students and teachers; and (d) the assumption was that schools must build capacity to serve more complex students *before* they are placed in typical classrooms.

Ten years later, data from the *23rd Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) supported the conclusion

that the decade of full inclusion had little effect on the relative percentage of students educated in general education settings. The data indicated that approximately 81% of students with E/BD were educated in general education settings during the 1989–1990 school year, as compared to 82% in 1998–1999.

One possible explanation for the stable placement rates of students with E/BD in general education settings is that barriers to responsible inclusion have not been fully addressed. This explanation is supported by voices from the field who have regularly attended working forums sponsored by the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD). Teachers, administrators, and others usually reach the consensus that various historical barriers continue to impinge upon appropriately serving students with challenging behavior in general education settings: the complexity and severity of students' misbehavior; the lack of differentiated curriculum and individualized accommodations and modifications; and the lack of trained, qualified personnel (Muscott, Menendez, James, & Jackson, 2002). Given the agreement that exists among researchers and practitioners, any attempt to enhance the academic and behavioral competence of students with E/BD within general education settings must address these as well as more recent obstacles such as high-stakes testing and high standards for all students (Muscott, et al., 2002).

In this chapter, I address the use of one curricular practice, service learning (SL), which can be designed to enhance academic and behavioral outcomes for students with E/BD and their typical peers who are being responsibly educated in general education settings. To that end, I begin with a discussion of SL and its potential for students with E/BD, followed by a brief explanation of positive behavioral interventions and support (PBIS) as the framework for delivering integrated SL programming. Discussion includes examples of evidence-based practices that show how SL programs can be integrated across the PBIS continuum for students with E/BD.

Service Learning and Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Service Learning Defined

Service learning can be defined as a method of instruction by which students participate in service programs that meet both community needs and the learning needs of the students themselves. Zlotkowski (1993) identified the characteristics of SL as (a) direct experiences working with communities in need and/or organizations that promote the public good, (b) reflection on the experience, and (c) planned reciprocity of learning and benefits. There are three broad types of SL experiences, usually referred to as *direct service, indirect service,* and *advocacy* (Dunlap, Drew, & Gibson, 1994). In direct approaches, students engage in face-to-face interactions with the people being served at either the service site or elsewhere in the community. Common examples include tutoring, mentoring, and providing activities for people who are institutionalized (e.g., senior citizen housing, group homes for people with disabilities, children's hospitals). Indirect approaches involve experiences that address a community need but in locations where the service providers and the recipients of service are physically distant from one another. Examples of indirect experiences include writing letters to incarcerated individuals, providing recreational materials for people who are hospitalized, and raising money for a family in need. Advocacy approaches are aimed at increasing public awareness of a problem or issue affecting individuals, the community, or the nation as a whole.

Rationale for Service Learning

There are a number of reasons SL would be an appropriate intervention for students with E/BD in general education settings. First, SL has already been integrated successfully as an evidence-based practice in general education. According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (Skinner & Chapman, 1999), 32% of all public schools and nearly 50% of all high schools organized SL as part of the academic curriculum, with 53% reporting mandatory

participation. Moreover, there is abundant evidence that SL is an effective way to improve the cognitive and academic achievement, social and personal responsibility, and social development of K–12 students (Conrad, 1991; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Root, 1997).

Another reason for using SL with students with E/BD is that it is designed to create a partnership among participants in which all parties take ownership for the process and outcomes. Instead of viewing themselves as service providers helping the needy, students involved in SL programs are taught to view themselves as learning partners and active participants, learning themselves as they assist others to learn. This change in focus to student ownership and empowerment may help to change the field's image as a "curriculum of control" focused on obedience and compliance (Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleish, 1990) to that of a "reclaiming environment" aimed at promoting attachment, achievement, autonomy, and altruism in children and youths whose life histories have been characterized by destructive relationships, climates of futility, learned irresponsibility, and the loss of purpose. Brendtro, Brokenleg, and Van Bockern (1990) argued that restoring value and competence to alienated and discouraged children will promote caring as an antidote to narcissism and irresponsibility.

A third reason for using SL is that it is not purely academic study and therefore addresses teachers' frequently voiced concern that students with E/BD are not motivated to learn or complete schoolwork, particularly in areas in which their interest level is low or they are performing below grade level. Service learning combines analysis, application, and evaluation in an effort to integrate active service with academic reflection.

Students with E/BD are frequently the recipients of other people's generosity (Ioele & Dolan, 1993) and view themselves as "damaged goods" (O'Flanagan, 1997). Rarely are there opportunities to change either their own or other people's negative perceptions of them. Therefore, the fact that SL is a strength-based intervention is the fourth reason it holds promise for these students. Despite their limitations, students with E/BD also have strengths and gifts to share

with others. Service learning offers an opportunity for these students to share their gifts while simultaneously helping them practice social, communication, and academic skills in applied settings. Moreover, because SL programs are strength-based and designed to be experiential, practical, and connected to the real world, they have the potential to accomplish three important goals for these students: (a) promote self-esteem and self-worth through the successful completion of programs that have social importance; (b) engage disenfranchised students in school-related activities and curriculum; and (c) reframe others' pessimistic views of their worth and ability to contribute to society.

A fifth reason for using this approach is the emerging research base in the area of SL and students with E/BD. In a review of the literature, Muscott (2000) concluded that SL holds promise as an effective method of instruction for students with challenging behavior.

Designing Effective Service Learning Programs

Designing a high-quality SL program that meets community as well as learner needs requires careful planning, resources, and a dedication to best practices. Duckenfield and Swanson (1995) noted that SL programs typically follow four stages: preparation, action, reflection, and celebration. Muscott (2001a) has argued for an adaptation of two additional stages, evaluation and reconfiguration. In the preparation stage, community and learner needs are identified, goals and objectives are developed, programs are designed, recruitment takes place, and orientation or training is provided. The action stage involves both the service activities at the community site and any ongoing preparation or practice activities that occur in the classroom. The evaluation stage consists of both formative and summative activities that occur throughout the project. The recognition stage occurs at the end of the project and consists of a formal set of activities designed to celebrate the achievements of the participants. Finally, ongoing programs proceed through a reconfiguration stage, when evaluation data are used to adjust needs, goals, and

objectives in order to redesign programs for the future. Reflective activities take place throughout all stages of the project to better inform practice.

Students with E/BD present unique challenges to SL because of their limited social skills, particularly in the context of cooperative group activities, their high needs for structure, and their initial tendencies to think in terms of self, rather than service to others (Rockwell, 2001). To address these challenges, educators must go beyond the general guidelines provided earlier in this chapter and design initial programs that are highly structured and are based on a careful analysis of both group dynamics and the individual learning needs of students. Moreover, students must be provided with authentic programs that meet real needs, include opportunities to be responsible for important tasks, connect the service to goals and objectives that are included in their individualized education programs (IEPs) or behavior intervention plans (BIPs), and integrate reflection in every facet of the project from identifying needs through implementation and evaluation of outcomes. Specific suggestions for creating initial programs when the group of students has not coalesced include

1. Starting small and simple, beginning with programs that take place in the school, on school grounds, or close by. Less complex programs have a greater chance of success and provide the opportunity to get the bugs out.
2. Identifying indirect programs, rather than direct or advocacy programs. Examples include making instructional materials for other students or books for young children, or refurbishing toys for hospitalized children.
3. Highlighting short-term programs with lots of preparation in advance of implementation. Examples include gardening, landscaping, and murals.
4. Proposing programs that are of high interest to students. Students who are more interested in sports, art, videotaping, or carpentry, for example, would benefit from programs that include these elements.

5. Allowing students to choose among several programs. Having multiple community partners visit the class and pitch their site to the students is an empowering approach.
6. Matching students' talents to specific project roles. Programs should allow students who are more verbal, those who prefer drawing, those who like to work with their hands, and so forth to use those talents in the program.
7. Having students help other students who are either younger or have more severe disabilities. Students with E/BD often have to prove themselves in new situations and create a social pecking order. If direct service programs are chosen, those involving people who aren't a threat to the students' self-esteem will minimize this concern.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support and Service Learning

Many evidence-based practices die a lonely death in schools because they are add-ons to an already overloaded curriculum. To avoid that fate, SL opportunities for students with E/BD in general education settings must be integrated into the existing school structure in a systematic and comprehensive manner. One approach would be to infuse SL programs into a school-wide framework, such as PBIS, designed to improve school climate as well as the emotional well-being and academic achievement of all students (including those with E/BD). According to Sugai and colleagues (Sugai, 2002; Sugai & Horner, 1999), PBIS is the systematic organization of school environments and routines that enable educators to increase the capacity to adopt, use, and sustain effective behavioral practices and processes for all students. This approach emphasizes that prevention and remediation of academic and behavioral problems requires sustained attention to multiple systems of intervention: universal; specialized group or targeted; and specialized individual or intensive.

The PBIS model is based on a three-stage approach of primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention designed to provide a continuum of

effective behavioral support to all students in a given school. Level 1, primary prevention, provides universal interventions to address the approximately 80% to 90% of students who do not have serious behavioral or academic problems. Level 2, secondary prevention, includes group interventions for the roughly 5% to 10% of students considered at risk for developing behavioral disorders or academic failure. The remaining 1% to 5% of students with chronic and intense problem behaviors or academic limitations are addressed with specialized individual interventions at Level 3 of the system. The integration of SL into the PBIS model requires curricular alignment at the universal, targeted, and intensive levels. In the sections that follow, existing SL programs from the literature that include either students with short-term challenging behavior or those identified with E/BD will be used as examples for the integration of SL and PBIS.

Universal Interventions

One of the first tasks to be accomplished in a school employing the PBIS model is the delineation of expectations. These expectations should be broad enough to be applied across settings, positively framed, based on the ideal state, and designed to address any problem areas within the school climate. The most frequent expectations seen in schools are character education traits such as *being respectful, being responsible, being caring, being trustworthy,* and *being appreciative of diversity,* although specific behaviors such as *being safe* and learning goals such as *being an engaged learner* are also used. Service learning programs are a natural fit for many of these expectations, and programs such as beautification projects, recycling, or cross-age tutoring could be undertaken as part of the academic curriculum.

One example of a universal program approach involved students with E/BD and other disabilities from multiple schools throughout an entire state (Brill, 1994). In this program model developed by the Maryland Student Service Alliance, more than 2,000 students with mild to profound disabilities, including those with E/BD, were involved in ongoing projects each year. Students were usually

involved in direct projects such as peer tutoring, although there were also indirect projects such as cleaning and mending clothing for people with limited incomes and advocacy projects. Brill reported the results of an informal study designed to explore the effects of participation in SL on 315 adolescents with disabilities, ages 12 to 21, who had engaged in SL projects for between 6 and 21 months. The number of students with E/BD was not included. Two thirds of the students were involved in integrated projects with students without disabilities. Using survey methodology, Brill asked the students' 13 special education teachers to respond to a series of questions about behavior, academics, socialization, attendance, and relationships with peers without disabilities. The teachers reported positive changes in their students as a result of participation in SL. All or nearly all of the teachers reported improved socialization skills, behavior, and attitudes of their students. More specifically, adolescents with mild disabilities demonstrated improved academic performance and increased attendance, while those with severe to profound disabilities exhibited improvements in relationships with students without disabilities.

Targeted Interventions

In the PBIS model, students who exhibit early patterns of misbehavior would be identified and referred to a problem-solving team through a data-based process before their behavior became intensive and chronic. Once a student was referred, the team would gather information and could recommend a targeted, short-term group intervention to support the student's prosocial skill acquisition.

A prime example of this type of program is the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) developed by Lantieri (1999) in collaboration with Educators for Social Responsibility. The RCCP was originally designed as a primary or universal intervention aimed at creating social responsibility in elementary school children. Subsequently, a secondary intervention was developed specifically for children who were at risk for school failure based on an early history of behaviors that correlate with violence later in life. The secondary prevention program has become a national demonstration

program supported by the Center on Crime, Communities, and Culture of the Open Society Institute. The 30-week program involves team-building and conflict-resolution activities created to increase caring and cooperative behaviors and develop interpersonal skills. It culminates with an SL project designed to help others in the school or local community. Examples of programs include making Easter baskets for people with mental challenges living at a center, holding food drives for families in need, collecting materials and books for hospitalized children, and coordinating a peace program.

The program hired an outside evaluator to assess its outcomes (Metis Associates, Inc., 1998). Based on surveys and follow-up focus groups, the evaluators reported that the students were overwhelmingly satisfied with the program and had made gains in a number of areas, including getting along with others. The students' self-reports revealed they learned conflict-resolution and anger-management strategies and improved their listening skills and ability to share with others. Finally, classroom teachers indicated that the at-risk students exhibited more positive attitudes toward school, an increased willingness to cooperate with peers and teachers, and increased self-esteem.

Intensive Interventions

About 1% to 5% of the school population exhibit behavior that is so severe and chronic that universal and targeted interventions alone would be insufficient to produce behavior change. Under IDEA, some of these students would be identified as having E/BD, and their IEPs should include behavior intervention plans and reflect curricular and instructional accommodations and modifications. One possible curricular intervention is SL. While the literature contains a number of examples of SL programs involving students with E/BD in self-contained, day treatment, or residential programs (Emery & Richardson Turpin, 1996; Frey, 2001; Ioele & Dolan, 1993; Kraft & Wheeler, 2002; Murry, 2001; O'Flanagan, 1997; Rockwell, 1997; 2001), only one program, Service Learning Opportunities (SO) Prepared for Citizenship (Muscott, 2001a; 2001b), was designed specifically for students with E/BD and typical peers.

The SO Prepared for Citizenship program is a national demonstration model supported by the Learn and Serve America program, the New Hampshire College and University Council, and the New Hampshire Department of Education. The 15-week after-school program was specifically designed to enhance the character development of elementary and middle school students with E/BD and other disabilities, as well as students who were at risk for E/BD and student leaders in schools where character education was a universal intervention.

In the 7 years the program has been in existence, more than 150 children and more than 200 high school and college students have participated. The SO program uses high school and college mentors involved in SL experiences in their respective schools to deliver a character education curriculum (Muscott & Muscott, 2003) that focuses on (a) responsibility and self-control, (b) trustworthiness, (c) respect for and appreciation of diversity, and (d) caring and compassion. The lessons include language arts, literature, science, math, art, and drama activities. Each theme lasts 1 month and culminates with a specific SL activity. Examples of SL programs include organizing holiday food drives, clearing nature trails, planting flower gardens, and coordinating recycling programs.

In an ethnographic study designed to assess participants' knowledge of the curriculum and perceptions of the program, Muscott and Talis O'Brien (1999) analyzed data gathered from in-depth interviews of 19 students with behavioral, learning, and language disabilities and those identified as at risk for developing problems who participated in the program at one inner-city school in New Hampshire during the 1997–1998 school year. The students believed the program taught them, among other things, how to cooperate with students of different ages to solve problems, what it means to be a citizen-leader and a member of a team, how to be responsible when confronted with the answers to a test, and how to reach out to peers from diverse backgrounds who are new to the school. Overall, four broad themes were generated from student responses. The students expressed responsibility for their actions, responded to the ideas of cooperation and teamwork and respect for

and appreciation of diversity, learned to make new friends, and found learning about character to be fun and rewarding.

Conclusion

The responsible inclusion of students with E/BD will continue to present educators both challenges and opportunities. One opportunity involves the use of SL to enhance the curriculum and meet the learning needs of students who are likely to need an experiential, differentiated program of instruction in which empathy, compassion, and empowerment are highlighted.

The argument was made that SL, within the framework of PBIS, would be an appropriate intervention for students with E/BD who are educated in general education settings. Both SL and PBIS are evidenced-based and increasingly common practices in general education programs and therefore likely to be adopted by faculty and students alike. Only time will tell whether integrated programs—in which students with E/BD and their typical peers work collaboratively on service activities that meet community needs and learning needs simultaneously—will prove effective in enhancing the lives of all the participants.

4

From the Road to School to Home, Ensuring No Child Left Behind

Practical Behavioral Strategies That Include Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Beverley H. Johns
Jacksonville, Illinois

Eleanor C. Guetzloe
Clearwater, Florida

All school personnel must be committed to the creation of a school environment in which children can grow both academically and socially. No Child Left Behind includes students with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD), certainly the most challenging and difficult to reach but neediest group of children served in our schools today. These are the children who are frequently suspended from school; who often drop out because they feel disconnected with the school; who often exhibit poor attendance; and who have the lowest

graduation rates. These are the children for whom, if we want to make a significant impact on education, we must provide a positive and successful learning environment.

If students with E/BD are to grow, education personnel must work to keep them in school and provide relevant academic experiences so that they want to be there. Previous chapters discussed instructional strategies to ensure an appropriate academic experience. Here, we offer an overview of the key components in a school setting that provide a positive environment from the time the students get on the bus until the time they arrive back home.

What does the positive environment look like? Educators agree on the need for school programs (particularly for young children) that prevent serious behavioral problems and promote emotional health. Shedlin (1986) pointed out that between nursery school and sixth grade, a child spends 9,000 hours in school—more than twice the amount of time spent in high school. He proposed a qualitative approach for professionals to use in evaluating a school, using questions such as the following:

- Do the students and adults seem happy in the school environment?
- Is there a sense of delight, of enthusiasm and energy, in teaching and learning?
- Are cultural and linguistic differences among students celebrated?
- Is there evidence—in both verbal and nonverbal interaction—that students and adults within the school have mutual respect and regard for one another?
- Is there as much interest in the "how" of learning as there is in the "how well"?

School Personnel as Role Models

Seligman (1999) identified qualities that help buffer against mental illness, including courage, optimism, interpersonal skills, a work

ethic, hope, responsibility, future-mindedness, honesty, and perseverance. These are strengths that school personnel must model for children. From the time a child steps onto the school bus, the child sees adults as examples of ways to behave. Our message has to be consistent with our performance. We must be pleasant and excited about our work. We must treat our students fairly and give them a sense of hope for the future. We must teach them how to plan for the future. When we make a mistake, we should honestly admit that we made the mistake. Johns (2000) and others have urged all educators to avoid engaging in negative interactions with children and to refrain from criticizing, nagging, or publicly rebuking students.

Training and Support for School Personnel

In working with students with E/BD, it is realistic to accept that we will never have all the answers and, to be effective educators, we must be lifelong learners. School personnel should seize every opportunity to learn and grow. Organizations such as the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD) provide multiple opportunities for professional development through regional and national conferences, Web site content, and publication of journals and monographs. We encourage readers to visit the Council for Exceptional Children Web site as well.

Establishing and maintaining successful inclusive environments for students with E/BD requires ongoing inservice training and consultative/technical support. The Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE; Westat, 2000) conducted in 2000 reported that 75% of students with disabilities spend much of their day in general education classes. Yet only about 50% of general educators who had taught for 6 or fewer years received any preservice preparation in ways to accommodate students with disabilities instructionally and only two thirds were taught how to manage student behavior. That same study revealed that professional development efforts do not always reflect best practices such as actively engaging teachers in the learning process or allowing time for planning how to imple-

ment newly acquired skills. Finally, the content does not necessarily mirror accumulated research on the effective strategies for students with E/BD.

The use of teacher mentoring is becoming more popular within the school environment. Generally speaking, general education teachers found formal mentoring programs more helpful than did special educators, according to SPeNSE. This may be because special education teachers were less likely to have a mentor in their building whose teaching skills and responsibilities were similar to their own. To be effective, school administrators need to work to pair new personnel, whether bus driver or teacher, with an experienced person in a similar position and find ways to support the development of quality practices (e.g., limit committee assignments, control numbers of students in class). Otherwise, the temptation increases to abandon research-based practices and adopt those of the workplace.

When educators find themselves in environments where professional development is not encouraged or supported, membership in professional organizations becomes even more important. It provides an opportunity to participate in e-mail support networks, access Web sites, gain access to journals and newsletters and learn about conferences, and network with individuals who are facing similar issues.

The SPeNSE study (2000) defined school climate as the extent to which schools are caring and supportive of students and faculty and staff. As such, school climate is related to special education teachers' workload manageability and intent to stay. Potentially negative effects of a burdensome workload can be offset by supportive administrators and colleagues.

Positive School Climate

Getting to School

Adults who model optimism and hope help to create a positive environment for children. Children should get on the bus and be greeted by someone who recognizes them and can find something positive

to say. Children may spend more than an hour on a school bus, and what they experience during that time can set the stage for what follows in school. Teachers, administrators, and bus drivers need to work together to establish positive expectations for all students for appropriate bus behavior, recognition for complying with those expectations, and clear consequences for not following them, as well as direct instruction regarding those behaviors when necessary. Bus drivers also need to know about children who require specialized assistance. For example, a child with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder may need something productive to do while on the bus—perhaps something appropriate to read or play with or something to listen to with headphones.

School personnel and administrators should collaborate to establish a system, rather than say, "Bus behavior isn't my problem." Teachers can prepare a short form for the bus driver to complete to report to the teacher how the bus ride went the night before and that morning. It might consist of a checklist that includes information on setting events (e.g., possible problems at home or the bus stop), antecedent events (e.g., negative interaction with another child), and possible reasons for the behavior. The teacher can provide a reward for a student who had a good bus ride. Another idea is to have the bus driver hand out "White Slips" for appropriate bus behavior. The student's name is put on the white slip. The bus driver gives these to all students who have a good bus ride, and the students bring them in to school. There is a drawing for a small prize each day. Students like recognition. We have found this to be effective not only for young children, but also for teenagers if they have the chance to win something they value.

Within the School

Once children get to school, the environment must be inviting, warm, and welcoming. School should be a beautiful place where children want to be. All of us need beauty in our lives. Here is a checklist to assess the beauty of a school and classroom:

1. Are the building and classroom clean and well lit?

2. Are the building and classroom organized, with items kept in their place?
3. Are there displays of all students' work?
4. Are there plants (real and/or silk) and pictures or other evidence of a positive environment in the building?
5. Are inviting learning areas present (e.g., comfortable chairs, lamps for reading, tablecloths on tables)?

As students arrive at school, they should be greeted by faculty and staff with positive comments that are appropriate for the student population: "Great to see you," "Wow, you look good today," "Your hair looks nice today." Rules and expectations should be posted prominently in the building and be stated positively. All students need to be taught both school-wide and classroom-level expectations and given frequent reminders. Students who follow the rules and expectations need frequent reinforcement. For example, any staff member who sees a student walking quietly down the hall should comment, "Thank you for walking quietly in the hall." If a rule is posted in the classroom that students are to raise their hands, when they do so the educator should remember to say, "Thank you for raising your hand." When students fail to comply with expectations, the faculty should accept responsibility for reintroducing instruction.

School personnel should work together to prepare positive recognition for students, such as school award assemblies focusing on recognition for good behavior, attendance, and academics that parallel daily forms of recognition (e.g., verbal praise, tokens).

The classroom and the school must be a positive environment for students with E/BD to be successful. A positive learning environment can be a powerful preventive tool to reduce behavioral problems for all students. When school-wide and classroom-level support are not enough for the student, the more specific plan in the individualized education program (IEP)—the behavioral intervention plan (BIP)—must be developed based on a functional assessment of

behavior. By conducting a functional assessment, school personnel are able to look at the motivation for the student's behavior—whether it be access to attention, desire to escape, a sensory need, or a combination of these and other functions. Once we identify the functions of the behavior, individualized positive interventions must be developed for the student. All parts of the day must be considered in the BIP, and all persons responsible for its implementation should be involved in the planning process and subsequent modifications to the plan.

Alternatives to Suspension

Our responsibility as educators is to keep students in school, not to exclude them. If students are repeatedly suspended from school, they cannot learn. Moreover, the probability increases that they may become involved in antisocial acts and find more reason not to come to school. For many students, suspension serves as a reward, especially if school is not a positive experience, such as when the academic work is too difficult and instruction is flawed or ineffective.

Logical consequences for inappropriate behavior are more effective than suspension. For example, if a student is caught smoking in the bathroom, it is more appropriate to apply a consequence designed to teach new behavior. Depending on the student's level, he or she could research and write a paper on what smoking does to your health and the negative social aspects of smoking. The student could also be searched for a specific period of time when entering school to make sure that he or she is not carrying cigarettes. If the student is carrying cigarettes, they are confiscated; the student is given a receipt; and the cigarettes are held until the end of the year when the parent or legal guardian can pick them up. School personnel should seek proactive alternatives to suspension that are designed to keep students in school while providing a consequence for inappropriate behavior.

Parental Involvement and Support

There is little question that parental involvement and support are an asset to schools. However, some parents of students with E/BD may have had their own negative experience and/or a negative feeling about school because the only time they heard from the school is when their child was in trouble. Given the challenges that students pose, it is tempting to criticize others, especially when we are struggling to deal with significant learning and behavior problems. Often, parents are dealing not only with the stress of the behavioral challenges of their child, but also with financial issues and family discord. Parents need our support.

Johns, Crowley, and Guetzloe (2002) have recommended that educators start the school year on a positive note by contacting parents as soon as the fall term begins or as quickly as a student is assigned to the school or class. Parents should be provided information about the school and the specific classroom program as well as the various ways that they can contribute to the classroom. Establishing an advisory group that meets outside of the school might be a useful way to begin the year.

With today's technology there are many ways to communicate with parents. Some schools have a homework hotline; some schools provide voice mail so that the teachers can easily get messages from parents; many schools now have Web sites that provide information about the school and activities. However, not all parents have access to these technologies, and nothing is as effective as face-to-face contact. If a parent cannot or will not come into the school, school personnel need to go to the parent. If the parent is uncomfortable with someone coming to his or her home, it may be possible to arrange to meet at a neutral site—a coffee shop, community center, or similar setting.

An open house is one way to get parents into the school, but often they need to be offered inducements to get them there. A teacher might take a picture of the family, get it developed, put it in a frame, and then send it home. Job counseling and community services per-

sonnel might be invited to attend open houses to offer their services to parents.

Kea (1997) reported that often when parents of African American students enter a school, they feel they become consent givers or recipients of information, advice, or recommendations, rather than partners in the teaching/learning process. Kea offered several practical strategies for working with parents of African American students: Explore your own culture and values; acknowledge that there are cultural differences; assess and improve your knowledge of African American culture; interact more with culturally diverse families; and become familiar with the resources in the African American community. Regardless of parental background, according to Guetzloe (1994), all parents must be included in the planning of any inclusive program for their child. They should be given an active voice and have choices regarding both the level and location of services for their child.

Conclusion

Mohandas K. Gandhi said, "You must be the change you wish to see in the world." We must each be change agents in our schools to ensure that students with challenging behaviors are part of the school and that they daily experience an environment that is positive, nurturing, and conducive to successful outcomes.

5

Administrative Issues in Inclusive Education

Needed Supports

Robin Bauer
Braidwood Elementary, Illinois

An administrator who is informed, involved, and willing to find the necessary supports is an essential part of a successful program. Effective administrators work to establish relationships with all stakeholders—students, teachers, support staff, and parents. The principal must be viewed as approachable and trustworthy. The simplest way to build that perspective is by interacting daily with the members of the school community. Everything the principal says and does communicates intention to various stakeholders. If the principal intends to be approachable but is not available, the intention is lost. Being visible throughout the day communicates a sense that the administrator is someone who welcomes interaction (Peterson & Deal, 1998) and sets the stage for effective program development.

Communicate, Communicate, Communicate

Students and parents react positively to social initiations. Knowing students by name and being aware of family situations is an effective way to build relationships. Students walk a little taller when they enter the school building and the principal calls them by name and offers a comment on something positive of value to them. Likewise, parents feel good when they begin to speak to the principal and the principal knows which class their child is in and can share a recent positive interaction or accomplishment of the child (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1997). These and other simple practices increase administrator involvement with parents and students throughout the school year.

Now think of a situation in which a student is not finding success in school—a student with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD). If the principal has established positive relationships, it is easier to problem solve when difficult situations arise. Consider the idea that children need five positive comments to offset the one negative redirection they receive. It seems true for parents as well. The parents of a child with E/BD may feel they are in an "us against them" situation. Just when things improve, they often take a turn for the worse. Frequent conversations in which the administrator conveys positive ideas and comments do wonders in offsetting negative interactions when problems occur. In the same way, a relationship in which the student feels that the principal cares and has the student's best interest first, will also improve student behavior.

Supporting Students

Effective school principals support a proactive, systematic approach to promote positive behavior, rather than a system of punishments. Every school needs to have a system of behavioral supports for all students. It is important that staff (including lunchroom personnel

and custodians), students, and parents be familiar with and understand the system, in order to be successful within it.

Students need to be provided a clear set of expectations. These expectations need not be extensive and may consist of just three rules: Be respectful of others, be responsible for yourself, and be ready to learn. Although the expectations are important, the way in which the students are taught about what these statements mean will determine the success of the system. Students must be instructed on what these behaviors "look like" within and across all settings. For example, what does "Be respectful of others" look like in the hallways, classrooms, lunchroom, and school bus? To thoroughly teach the expectations, school personnel must establish a uniform lesson plan that includes modeling and role play. Once taught, these expectations should be displayed throughout the school building (Sack, 1999).

Each class will translate school-wide expectations into what they look like in the classroom. These expectations should be reviewed often. A school-wide reinforcement program for student behavior that meet these expectations should be developed and publicized. It is important to recognize that about 90% of students are able to function within this program. Teachers who might otherwise be unsupportive of reward systems are increasingly more accepting of the idea that good kids get recognition for doing what is right. Most students are able to understand, accept, and comply with these expectations.

What about the students who don't meet the expectations? Each school-wide program must include some consequences for inappropriate and unacceptable behavior. Most students will correct their behavior after the imposition of these consequences. However, there may be students—especially students identified with E/BD—who need additional behavioral supports. This is where the role of principal can be important; it is an opportunity for the student to learn and the principal to teach. If the principal administers punishment (e.g., "If I don't bring my book three times, I get a detention"), what

does the student learn? But if the principal relates not having a book to the expectation of "Be ready to learn," it may have more meaning to the student. Together, the student and principal can develop a plan to remember to bring books to class and then the principal can support that plan and reinforce the desired behavior. What might the student learn? "If I don't bring my book, there are consequences; but I can change that behavior and my principal is willing to help me to do so."

Obviously, failure to bring a book to class is not a dangerous behavior; students with E/BD may exhibit more serious behavior problems. Behaviors that severely impede the student's learning and/or detract from instruction of others in the classroom require a functional behavioral assessment. Behaviors are targeted, data are collected, and a behavioral intervention plan is put into place that is aligned with the behavior. The principal may or may not play a part in the intervention plan but should be involved in all IEP meetings in which the plan is developed. It is at this point that the team may need to reassess the appropriateness of student placement in an inclusive setting.

Supporting Teachers

Teaching students with E/BD can be very stressful. Stressful situations can escalate and become unmanageable situations. A major factor can be teachers' sense that they are on their own. Principals who have been involved with efforts to deal successfully with students can identify ways to offer support to their teachers.

When a student with E/BD is included in a general education classroom for part or all of the school day, the classroom teacher is not the only person responsible for this student. At the least, there is a special education teacher consulting with the classroom teacher, and there may also be a teacher assistant, social worker, and administrator closely involved with the student.

Given the complexity of presenting problems and the mix of professionals involved, some regular common planning time is essential.

Preferably, some of that planning time occurs with the grade-level team and some occurs with the team working with the particular student. Proactive plans can be made for situations that typically trigger unacceptable behaviors, such as teaching specific skills to use in a cooperative learning activity. Alternative plans can be made for high-probability stressful situations, such as having a social worker go along on a field trip. The challenge is to find the time to do this planning. Again, with administrative and collegial support, the time spent planning proactively saves time in the end, as well as allowing the student to find success in each situation.

Faculty and staff members who are adequately prepared usually experience more confidence and success in working with students with E/BD. Building-level principals can support the staff by providing release time and the financial resources for ongoing professional development. Realistically, this may require some creative thinking; few administrators like having all special education staff out of the building at the same time. In some cases, professional development may mean that one or two staff members train to be trainers and subsequently provide training to their colleagues, with release time from the principal. Another option is to purchase books or videotaped staff training programs to use at scheduled meeting times. Although finding qualified people is not easy, the principal should provide substitutes for both special education teachers and teacher assistants when they are not in their classrooms.

The principal must take the time to listen without distraction. Closing the door and putting papers aside signals to teachers that what they have to say is important. Sometimes, a teacher is looking for a break and an opportunity to regroup before getting back to the student. If a teacher brings a student to the principal's office, the door should remain open; details of the previous events do not need to be recounted. In some cases, the principal should provide a place for the student to work. It is useful to have books or practice work available for students. It may not work for the teacher to provide something for the student to do while he or she is out of the classroom. There are times when the student needs an opportunity to cool down. Teachers who feel they have administrative support usu-

ally won't take advantage of this. If a student spends more time in the principal's office than in the classroom, it's time to come up with a new plan.

Conclusion

Today, administrators experience frustration of their own as well as that of other school personnel. Providing support for inclusion is one of many daily challenges. Being proactive in all facets of this job reduces stress. Building positive *relationships; communicating* openly; and providing support to students, staff, and parents are ways that principals can establish an environment that promotes success for not only students with E/BD, but all students.

6

Inclusion—What Works

Case Studies

Barbara Sramek
Marshall, Wisconsin, Public Schools

Robin Brewer
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley

Vikki Seger
Traverse City, Michigan, Public Schools

Sherie Huber
Glen Ellyn, Illinois, School District #41

Linda Westpfahl
Puyallup, Washington, School District

Introduction

Including students identified as having emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD) in the general education environment presents myriad challenges. The content of previous chapters has highlighted various strategies with which to address those challenges. Throughout, the underlying premise has been that inclusion is a philosophy, not a place. Cheney and Muscott (1996), among others,

have asserted a philosophy of responsible inclusion, a practice that affords students a continuum of alternative placements. In mirroring the thoughts of our colleagues, we take the position that a continuum of alternative placements should be considered for each student with a disability. Consistent with the spirit and intent of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1997, we believe that the general education environment should be considered first as a part of the continuum.

It is important to acknowledge that IDEA does not mandate inclusion. However, the notion that, to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) has been a legal requirement since enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. Participation in the general education environment, to the extent that such participation meets the unique needs of the child, affords educational opportunity to a student with a disability in the LRE.

The following case studies illustrate experiences of students with E/BD who have been included in the general education environment as well as the educational professionals who have worked to serve and support both the students and each other. It is noteworthy to point out that all of the stakeholders have learned lessons along the way. The journey has not been easy. The case studies highlight the supports, strategies, and resources that have contributed to successful student outcomes in general education classrooms in PreK–12 settings.

Corina

Corina, a 10-year-old fourth grader, has been receiving support for an emotional disability since entering kindergarten. Up until this time, she had been receiving that support in a self-contained classroom. However, school personnel felt it was time for her to become a member of the general education class. With several years of behavioral programming, she had become well versed in various strate-

gies to address her emotional and behavioral needs. Experience has shown that Corina's behavioral and emotional difficulties often occurred when she was around age-level peers on the playground and in the halls. We felt that supervision and structure were key factors, and that a general education classroom would also provide her with the necessary clear boundaries and expectations.

Initial dialogue began with the teachers who were to be involved in Corina's placement. Knowing little about her beyond her placement history, they expressed uncertainty about their ability to meet her needs and concern about behavior that might disrupt the learning environment. These concerns are not uncommon; they have been identified as primary reasons for the failure of inclusionary programming (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995), at least in part because of the stress involved with inclusion (Forlin, 2001).

Given these early discussions, I found it important to provide them as much reassurance and specific knowledge as possible, both on paper and verbally. We spent time discussing strategies that have worked in the self-contained class and developing a plan to adapt those strategies for the general education classroom. We discussed possible classroom situations that could create conflict or problem behavior and developed a proactive plan for each. The teachers agreed to spend additional time establishing and defining classroom rules and expectations and ways to directly teach them. Finally, we developed a communication system to assure my consultative support when necessary, something that has been shown to aid in the success of inclusionary programs (Shapiro, Miller, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler, 1999). Collaboration proved to be essential to Corina's successful integration into the general education class. Various authorities, including Cheney and Barringer (1995), have stressed that intensive consultation will likely be necessary when trying to implement services for students with E/BD within general education settings. We found that to be the case. For Corina, it helped make her transition into a classroom situation that was little known to her a highly successful endeavor.

James—A Student in a Secondary Rural Setting

Teaching in a rural school setting provided special challenges. I was the only teacher that taught special education and Title I programs. The principal was always flexible and willing to work with me when new students arrived, but this student provided special challenges. James entered our K–12 school system in the middle of the semester. He had come from a school district about 50 miles away that provided him with the comfort of a self-contained classroom for middle school students with social and emotional disabilities. James left his cozy nest and invaded our quiet community. He was going to challenge anyone who got in his way.

Being the person that I am, I was determined to help James through this transition time. I had a caseload of students with many disabilities and worked primarily within the general education setting. It was the middle of the semester when James arrived, and the team thought we could develop a schedule for him in the general education class environment with support from special education and see how things worked out. He was included in math, science, language arts, P.E., art, reading, and woodshop. He received counseling from the school counselor every week, and I worked with him in language arts class and by helping the general education teachers develop and provide accommodations. James started out on a "honeymoon period" nicely. He liked the freedom of not being in a self-contained class and going with the typical students from class to class. However, homework was a different matter. He had not been responsible for doing homework previously. Now, his teachers didn't care whether he received special education services or not; they expected him to do homework. We set up a contract for James. He seemed to enjoy it and the attention he received working with me, and I kept a close check on how he was doing in his classes. He did fairly well and made it through the year.

The next year, James moved on to high school, and this created new challenges. His behavior began to escalate after the first couple of weeks of school. We decided to conduct a functional behavioral

assessment to identify the reason(s) for his growing behavior problems. We did discover that James had some attention needs, but power and control were an issue and he was also trying to escape situations that were difficult. With this information, we carefully revised his schedule. Algebra was James's most difficult subject, and he was failing. We decided he needed direct instruction on prealgebra. I wouldn't let him escape; we kept working on concepts until he completely understood them. Homework was assigned in all classes, but the amount of work was dependent on how much practice he needed. This was one accommodation we found helpful for several students. We often negotiated the amount of homework, and since this helped to address some of his power and control issues, he did turn it in a majority of the time.

Another change in the schedule had James working as a cross-age peer tutor. Once he was trained, James took this responsibility very seriously and always planned what he was going to do. James worked with the elementary students in reading. He would read to a small group of students, have them tell them about the story, work on sequencing of events, or listen to them read. He flourished while doing this, and the younger children loved having a high school student working with them. With the support we provided in other classes, James's behavior continued to improve. He still had outbursts from time to time, but he never endangered himself or others and he developed many friendships in high school.

For a host of reasons, James was successful in high school. He participated in sports after school and was a fantastic artist. By his senior year, he was receiving special education on a consultative basis only. His academics improved, his behavior was generally appropriate, and he was a pleasure to have in class.

Student K—A Preschooler

Student K was a good example of how some problem behaviors require a collaborative approach to remediate. K was a 4-year-old student attending an integrated Early Childhood Educational

Achievement Program (ECEAP) with typically developing peers. Students identified as needing specially designed instruction were integrated into a 4-day-per-week, 3-hour program of preschool activities. Referral issues for K included difficulties with communication, poor fine motor skills, limited play skills, problems with transitions between activities, and poor peer social interactions. An evaluation for special education revealed significant delays in communication, fine motor, and social-emotional skills. His pediatrician had made a prior diagnosis of pervasive developmental delay.

An individualized education program (IEP) was written for K that included special instruction on expressive and receptive language, fine motor skills, and social-emotional skills. A special education teacher was assigned to work with K in his ECEAP classroom two times per week on communication, and motor therapy was delivered once a week. A special education paraeducator worked with K and other students all 4 days of the program. At a weekly team meeting, ECEAP teaching staff, special education staff, and a consulting psychologist addressed the supports needed for all students enrolled in the program. Given K's difficult behaviors in the classroom, a functional behavioral assessment was conducted as part of his initial evaluation. Discussion about his progress was part of the weekly review of student needs.

A competing behavior pathway form was completed to identify problem behaviors, setting events, and maintaining consequences. In reviewing data from K's classroom, the most frequent fast trigger (antecedent) appeared to be transition from one activity to another. K would scream loudly, run away from staff, or hide under desks rather than change to a nonpreferred activity. A plan was devised to provide K advance notice of the need to change tasks and a picture schedule of what was to happen across his school day. High-probability preferred activities were interspersed between low-probability undesired tasks to build a positive pattern of work/play/work/finish/play. Review of his daily schedule became the first task the paraeducator completed with him as soon as he entered the classroom. A classroom schedule for the day became a part of the opening circle activity for all students.

After some direct preteaching and practice, K adjusted to the classroom routine and improved his ability to transition between activities. A card given to K to show "almost done" was used to give advance notice of changes nonverbally. K spent less time avoiding transitions, and exhibited decreased hiding, less running away when outside, and increased time engaged in completing tasks.

To check for progress, the Competing Behavior Pathway was updated and reviewed. Replacement behaviors for transitions at school were being achieved, but problem behaviors relating to play and social-emotional skill were continued areas of concern. K needed to develop the desired behavior of using an appropriate voice during play. A social story paired to a signal was planned. During his one-on-one time with either the special education teacher or the paraeducator, a social story for "Use your inside voice" was shared with K. Pictures of K in his classroom were used to show when this was needed. A visual cue was paired with the specific phrase "inside voice" to assist K in linking his behavior to the story. After sharing the story during opening circle with all students, classroom staff also consistently used the visual cue and specific phrase with all students. Within a short period of time, K no longer used an inappropriate voice inside. In addition, staff reported that the same strategy worked for all students.

Given his success with this social story, additional problem behaviors were identified and social stories were built and implemented for other behaviors. The method was positively accepted by K and his family, who used the visual cues and specific phrases as scripts to modify his behavior in other settings.

K made great progress the rest of the year within his ECEAP placement. By the end of the year, his social storybook had grown to seven skills that he was able to model and maintain across similar settings with consistent success. His mother also reported improved social/interpersonal skills at home and voiced less concern about taking him into public places. Unfortunately, K and his family did not stay the entire school year. K took along his social storybook and a letter for his next school tucked into his backpack. He left behind staff members who understood that working collaboratively can be

a powerful tool to bring about positive changes in child behavior. A functional behavioral assessment process helped to identify key factors, the manipulation of which produced significant behavior changes over time. Use of preteaching, scripts, and paired visual cues helped not only K, but also other students to develop more age-appropriate skills.

Susan

When Susan moved into our middle school, she brought with her an IEP that reflected self-contained placement. The last year had been particularly difficult; her father was dying of hepatitis C complications, and her mother was an alcoholic and drug abuser and unable to care for her. Susan's parents were also in their second year of divorce. In addition to the difficult time at school, Susan had recently been arrested and assigned to a probation officer. Officials in her previous school had her arrested for assault on another student.

Because her father had died recently, her aunt and uncle took custody and arranged for both Susan and her little brother to move in with them. Susan now was entering our school, and at the intake staffing her time in special education was decreased because she had done well there the previous 3 weeks. She was now at a resource level of service. The constant communication between home, school, and probationary services allowed for this lessening of time in special education. Upon entering school the next year, she was in special education for only one period a day.

Her behaviors were escalating as the anniversary of the father's death neared. The aunt and uncle repeatedly hospitalized her because of her escalation within their home and the effects of her behaviors on the family. Because of the supports in school, she continued to be successful there, earning good grades and with little discipline from her teachers or the administration. Because of the escalation at home, there eventually came a weekend stay at the juvenile detention center 2 weeks after the anniversary of her father's death.

The family received intensive services from the county mental health agency, as well as the probation office and the state family service agency. At this point, the special education teacher, probation officer, and mental health worker began weekly (as opposed to monthly) meetings to offer wraparound support that gave Susan a consistent message. This also allowed for successful support systems to be set in place in different settings.

Unfortunately, the aunt and uncle did give up custody, and Susan wound up in a group home. However, she remained successful in school throughout the process because of strong wraparound services.

7 Conclusion

In this monograph we have attempted to share with readers a range of information drawn from the experiences of classroom teachers, school administrators, and university faculty, all of whom have worked with students with emotional or behavioral disorders. The message we wished to convey is that we must serve all children who come to school. We recognize the enormity of that challenge—especially as it relates to students with E/BD and at a time of mounting pressure to produce and be accountable for positive changes. We accept that these changes do not come easily or overnight, nor can they all happen in inclusive settings. Still, by creating positive school learning environments, we will better serve all children.

References

Alley, G., & Deshler, D. (1979). *Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods.* Denver: Love.

Ayllon, T., & Roberts, M. D. (1974). Eliminating discipline problems by strengthening academic performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 7,* 71–76.

Bartlett, L. D., Weisenstein, G. R., & Etscheidt, S. (2002). *Successful inclusion for educational leaders.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Bateman, B., & Linden, M. (1998). *Better IEPS* (3rd ed.). Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Braaten, S., Kauffman, J. M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C. M. (1988). The regular education initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children, 55,* 21–27.

Brendtro, L. K., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future.* Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Brill, C. L. (1994). The effects of service learning on disabled adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 17,* 369–380.

Bullock, L. M., & Gable, R. A. (1994). *Monograph on inclusion: Ensuring appropriate services to children and youth with emotional/behavioral disorders-II.* Arlington, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Carman, R. A., & Adams, W. R. (1972). *Study skills: A student's guide for survival.* New York: Wiley.

Champaign, J. F. (1993). Decisions in sequence: How to make placements in the least restrictive environment. *EdLaw* [Briefing Papers 9, 10], 1–16.

Cheney, D., & Barringer, C. (1995). Teacher conference, student diversity, and staff training for the inclusion of middle school students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 3,* 174–182.

Cheney, D., & Muscott, H. (1996). Preventing school failure for students with emotional and behavioral difficulties through responsible inclusion. *Preventing School Failure, 40*(3), 109–116.

Choate, J. S. (Ed.). (1997). *Successful inclusive teaching; Proven ways to detect and correct special needs* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Clyde K. and Sheila K. v. Puyallup School District, 35 F3d 1396 (9th Cir. 1994).

Conrad, D. (1991). School-community participation for social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 540–548). New York: Macmillan.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services, 3,* 57–76.

Deshler, D. D., Ellis, E. S., & Lenz, B. K. (1996). *Teaching adolescents with learning disabilities: Strategies and methods* (2nd ed.). Denver: Love.

Dixon, R., Carnine, D. W., & Kameenui, E. J. (1996). *Instructional tools for students with learning difficulties.* Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Duckenfield, M., & Swanson, L. (1995). *Service learning: Meeting the needs of youth at risk.* Clemson, SC: The National Dropout Prevention Center.

Dunlap, N. C., Drew, S. F., & Gibson, K. (1994). *Serving to Learn: High school manual.* Columbia: South Carolina Department of Education.

Emery, M., & Richardson Turpin, S. (1996). Service learning: Making the community connection. *Beyond Behavior, 7*(1), 15–19.

Etscheidt, S. & Bartlett, L. D. (1999). The IDEA Amendments: A four-step approach for determining supplementary aids and services. *Exceptional Children, 65,* 163–174.

Forlin, C. (2001). Inclusion: Identifying potential stressors for regular class teachers. *Educational Research, 43,* 235–245.

Frey. L. M. (2001). Integrating classroom academics with community-based learning. *Beyond Behavior 10*(3), 22–29.

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (1999). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Giles, Jr., D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17,* 327–340.

Gorn, S. (1999). *What do I do when . . . The answer book on special education law* (3rd ed.). Horsham, PA: LRP.

Guetzloe, E. (2001, October). *Considerations for making inclusion work.* Paper presented at the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders International Conference on Children and Youth with Behavioral Disorders, Atlanta, GA.

Guetzloe, E. (1994). Inclusion of students with emotional/behavioral disorders: The issues, the barriers, and possible solutions. In L. Bullock & R. Gable (Eds.), *Ensuring appropriate services to children and youth with*

emotional / behavioral disorders (pp. 21–24). [Monograph]. Arlington, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Harris , K. R., & Graham, S. (1992). *Helping young writers master the craft: Strategy instruction and self-regulation in the writing process.* Cambridge, MA: Brookline.

Hartmann v. Loudoun County, 26 IDELR 167 (4th Cir. 1987).

Hedin, D. (1989). Students as teachers: A tool for improving school climate. *Social Policy, 17,* 42–47.

Hewett, F. M., & Taylor, F. D. (1980). *The emotionally disturbed child in the classroom: The orchestration of success* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Huefner, D. S. (2000). The risks and opportunities of the IEP requirements under IDEA 97. *Journal of Special Education, 33,* 194–206.

Huefner, D. S. (2002). *Getting comfortable with special education law: A framework for working with children with disabilities.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Idol, L., & West, J. F. (1993). *Effective instruction of difficult-to-teach students.* Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 300 et seq.

Ioele, M., & Dolan, A. (1993). Teaching courage: Service learning at Pathway School. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 1,* 20–23.

Johns, B. (2000). The peace-filled classroom. *Reaching Today's Youth, 4*(2), 27–31.

Johns, B., Crowley, E., & Guetzloe, E. (2002). *Effective curriculum for students with emotional and behavioral disorders.* Denver: Love.

Kauffman, J. M. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children, 60,* 6–16.

Kea, C. (1997). Reconnecting with African-American families. *Reaching Today's Youth, 2*(1), 57–61.

Knitzer, J., Steinberg, Z., & Fleisch, B. (1990). *At the schoolhouse door: An examination of programs and policies for children with behavioral and emotional problems.* New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Kraft, N. P., & Wheeler, J. (2002). *Service-learning and resilience in disaffected youth: A research study.* Retrieved March 28,2003, from http://nekesc.org/JWNK/sl_disaffected.pdf

Lantieri, L. (1999). Hooked on altruism: Developing social responsibility in at-risk youth. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 8,* 83–87.

Larrivee, B. (1985). *Effective teaching for successful mainstreaming.* New York: Longman.

Letter to Anonymous, 30 IDELR 707 (OSEP 1999).

Letter to Hall, 21 IDELR 58 (OSEP 1998).

Letter to Lott, 16 IDELR 84 (OSEP 1989).

Letter to Trahan, 30 IDELR 403 (OSEP 1998).

Letter to VanWart, 20 IDELR 1217 (OSEP 1993).

Letter to Verguson, 17 IDELR 471 (OSERS 1991).

Lewis, R. B., & Doorlag, D. H. (1991). *Teaching special students in the mainstream* (3rd ed.). New York: Merrill.

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2000). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective instruction.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Meese, R. L. (1996). *Strategies for teaching students with emotional and behavioral disorders.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Metis Associates, Inc. (1998). *The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) At-Risk Youth component: Summary of findings.* New York: Author.

Morgan, D. P., & Jenson, W. R. (1988). *Teaching behaviorally disordered students: Preferred practices.* New York: Merrill.

Murry, F. (2001). Aerosol is not a gang art: Service-learning can become a living. *Beyond Behavior 10*(3), 30–34.

Muscott, H. S. (2000). A review and analysis of service-learning programs involving students with emotional/behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children, 23,* 346–368.

Muscott, H. S. (2001a). An introduction to service-learning and students with behavioral disorders. *Beyond Behavior 10*(3), 8–15.

Muscott, H. S. (2001b). Service-learning and character education as "antidotes" for children with egos that cannot perform. In N. Belnap (Ed.), Children who hate. [Special issue]. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions, 10,* 95–103.

Muscott, H. S., Menendez, A., James, D. M., & Jackson, J. (2002). Proactive approaches to working with students with challenging behaviors: Voices from the field. In L. M. Bullock & R. A. Gable (Eds.), *School-wide proactive approaches to working with students with challenging behaviors* (pp. 32–37). Arlington, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Muscott, H. S., Morgan, D. L., & Meadows, N. B. (1996). Planning and implementing effective programs for students with emotional and behavioral disorders within inclusive schools. In L. M. Bullock & R. A. Gable (Eds.), *Positive programming for children and youth with behavioral disorders: Strategies, supports, and services that work.* Arlington, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Muscott, H. S., & Muscott, A. J. (2003). *The SO Prepared for Citizenship Character Education Curriculum.* Nashua, NH: Rivier College.

Muscott, H. S., & Talis O'Brien, S. (1999). Teaching character education to students with behavioral and learning disabilities through mentoring relationships. *Education and Treatment of Children, 22,* 373–390.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1997). *Proficiencies for principals.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

O'Flanagan, B. (1997). Building purpose through service. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 5,* 223–225, 228.

OSEP Memorandum, 95–9, 21 IDELR 1152 (OSEP 1994).

Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership, 56*(1), 28–30

Rief, S. F., & Heimburge, J. A. (1996). *How to reach and teach all students in the inclusive classroom.* West Nyack, NY: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Rockwell, S. (1997). Building responsibility through entrepreneurship and service. *Reaching Today's Youth, 4*(1), 43–48.

Rockwell, S. (2001). Service-learning: Barriers and benefits. In H. S. Muscott (Ed.), Creating a curriculum for caring: Involving students with emotional and behavioral disorders in service-learning programs. *Beyond Behavior 10*(3), 16–21.

Root, S. C. (1997). School-based service: A review of research for teacher educators. In J. A. Erickson & J. B. Anderson (Eds.), *Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Sack, J. L. (1999). An ounce of prevention. *Education Week, 19*(9), 32–34.

Schumm, J. S., & Vaughn, S. (1995). Getting ready for inclusion: Is the stage set? *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 10,* 169–179.

Seligman, M. (1999). Positive social science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 1,* 181–182.

Senate report on the IDEA Amendments of 1997. Available: wais.access.gpo.gov.

Shapiro, E. S., Miller, D., Sawka, K., Gardill, M. C., & Handler, M. W. (1999). Facilitating the inclusion of students with E/BD into general education classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Disorders, 7*(2), 83–93, 127.

Shedlin, A. (1986). New lenses for viewing elementary schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68,* 139–142.

Siegel, E. (1973). *Special education in the regular classroom.* New York: John Day.

Skinner, R., & Chapman, C. (1999). Service-Learning and community service in K–12 public schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Sugai, G. (2002, April). *School-wide positive behavior supports: Achieving and sustaining effective learning environments for all students.* Written testimony submitted to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Washington, DC.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (1999). Discipline and behavioral support: Preferred processes and practices. *Effective School Practices 17*(4), 10–22.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Twenty-third annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Educa-*

tion Act. Retrieved March 22, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/Products/OSEP2001AnlRpt/Section_III.pdf

Vaughn, S., Bos, C. S., & Schumm, J. S. (1997). *Teaching mainstreamed, diverse, and at-risk students in the general education classroom.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Westat. (2000). *Study of personnel needs in special education.* Washington, DC: Office of Special Education Programs.

Yell, M. L. (1998). *The law and special education.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Zlotkowski, E. (1993). Service learning as campus culture. In T. Y. Kupiec (Ed.), *Rethinking tradition: Integrating service with academic study on college campuses* (pp. 47–51). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Inclusive Education for Children and Youths with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Enduring Challenges and Emerging Practices

Author(s):

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☒

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: [signature]

Printed Name/Position/Title: Lynda M Bullock

Organization/Address: CCBD

Telephone: 918-525-3563

FAX: 918-585-4003

E-Mail Address:

Date: 11-3-03

(over)

002/010

CEC

10/24/03 09:11 FAX

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
1110 North Glebe Road
Suite 300
Arlington VA 22201-5704

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

003/010
CEC
10/24/03 09:11 FAX